

REMARKS

The above amendments and the following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated September 20, 2005. Claims 8-10, 24-27, 34-35 and 37 are pending in this application with claim 36 cancelled by the present amendment. Of these claims, claims 8-10 and 24-27 were allowed. In the Office Action dated September 20, 2005, the Specification was objected to; claims 34, 35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 34, 35 and 37 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. No new matter has been added. Claims 34, 35 and 37 are presented for reconsideration. Claims 8-10 and 24-27 have been allowed.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification was objected to as the result of a typographical error on page 39. Applicant has amended the Specification to correct this error. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 34, 35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 34 so that claims 34, 35 and 37 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and

withdrawal of the rejection of claims 34, 35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) as shown in Figure 7 in view of Okazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,247,533, "Okazaki"). The cancellation of claim 36 renders moot this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 34, 35 and 37 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. Applicant has amended claim 34 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 34, 35 and 37.

Allowed Claims

Claims 8-10 and 24-27 were allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendments and remarks have overcome the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action dated September 20, 2005. Specifically, Applicant's amendment to the Specification overcomes the objection to the

Specification. Applicant's amendment to claim 34 overcomes the rejection of claims 34, 35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant's cancellation of claim 36 renders moot the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 34, 35 and 37 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claims 34, 35 and 37. Claims 8-10 and 24-27 are allowed.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 100006-00005.

Respectfully submitted,

ARENT FOX PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810
RJH/elz/lbm

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time

TECH/393839.1